HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 46 Wednesday, November 18, 1959 Washington, D. C.

WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

ROCKEFELLER: *Money starts talking* .....(page 1)
TV QUIZ: *All those "liberal" lawyers* .....(page 1)
FARMS: *A new "rackets" committee?* .....(page 2)
ECONOMY: *GOP returns to normal* .....(page 3)
BUTLER: *Slapping at the South again* .....(page 4)

The Rockefeller Drive: The words of a slouch-hat-wearing veteran New York political reporter—that the Presidential "smoke-filled room" of the Republican party now means the board room of the Chase Bank—came to mind last week as the room began to fill with affluent string-pullers. The occasion was Nelson Rockefeller's West Coast swing, his most ambitious political safari since last year's New York State gubernatorial campaign.

Wall Street's strategy, brought to light by HUMAN EVENTS in prior campaigns, was dissected in the conservative Los Angeles *Times* November 8 by political editor Kyle Palmer, who wrote:

> **"The power of money—a great deal of money—began making itself felt in California last week just in advance of the appearance here of Nelson Rockefeller, Governor of New York and an increasingly active candidate for President.**

"From the Chase Bank in New York, or, rather, the bank's vice chairman, David Rockefeller, came the suggestion to California corporation heads that it would be considered quite a friendly thing if a certain amount of attention could be paid brother Nelson while he is in California. You'd be astonished at the reaction.

" . . . it was quite evident that some of those approached were disposed to feel that a certain amount of pressure lay behind the polite suggestion of brother David. This is Nixon country, by and large, and many a business executive who has little aptitude or enthusiasm for personal participation in practical politics felt a mite uncomfortable under the circumstances . . . "

Palmer stated that pressure had been put on Coast sources to arrange banquets and receptions for Nelson, the idea no doubt being to create the impression that Nixon doesn't have it all his own way in California (Rockefeller people are worried about Nixon's strength in New York) and that Rockefeller has national standing—the ability to draw enthusiastic listeners 3,000 miles from home.

This trip is interpreted on Capitol Hill as the big kickoff in the contest between big money and GOP professional and grass roots sentiment, the former having won out every time since the Street nominated Willkie.

In any event, the Nixon people are running scared, not counting on the barrage of "ifs" thrown in Nelson's path by the news magazines and pundits. They know these "ifs" will fall like tenpins if Wall Street is able to tell Main Street which way to jump next July.

Nixon Drive Commences: In New Hampshire, Rockefeller's golden steamroller is plodding through the Granite State, oblivious of the strong Nixon sentiment among the populace (admitted even by "liberal" pollsters). One New Hampshirite stated: "Rockefeller is such an underdog he can't lose anything here." But Rockefeller backers (including his strong contacts at Dartmouth and other institutions) are making the most of their underdog role to gain sentiment and support.

The chief Nixon thorn so far has been disunity among his supporters. No one questions Nixon's standing with top Republicans, but many Nixon backers are cool to Governor Powell, who is understood to like Dick. Powell and Nixon recently held a 45-minute phone conversation, the Governor advertising the fact to show he is in Nixon's corner while not committing himself.

The "New Hampshire Nixon-for-President Committee" has now taken shape, with headquarters at 6 N. Main Street, Concord, N.H. It is headed by Senators Styles Bridges and Norris Cotton, former Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks, and former GOP national committeeman Frank J. Sulloway. Some of these effective pros were active in the impressive 23,000 write-in vote for Nixon in the 1956 primary, heading off the "dump Nixon" escapade of Harold Stassen.

TV Lawyers: "Liberals" of the press and in the halls of Congress are trying to make political hay of the TV quiz show scandals by linking the bogey-man "Big Advertising" with the Republican party in the public mind—but the hard facts point in exactly the opposite direction.

Washington noticed—though most of the Nation's press did not—that "liberal" Democratic lawyers represented many of the witnesses most involved in the various programs under investigation.

"Twenty-One" producer Albert Freedman, who admitted putting the fix on in his show, was represented by Charles S. Murphy—a special counsel to President Truman during the latter's Administration. And the heads of Revlon cosmetic company, sponsor of "The $64,000 Question," were represented by lawyers who have connections with two Democratic Presidential hopefuls. Company President Charles Revson's lawyer was Clark Clifford, well-known in Washington as a member of Truman's brain-trust and a top aide during the 1948

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. — Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

campaign. Clifford is now beating the bushes, rounding up delegates for Missouri's Senator Stuart Symington, the "compromise candidate." Martin Revson, former company vice-president who denied he knew anything about the fix (contradicting two producers who said he did), was represented by Max M. Kampleman, former administrative assistant to Senator Hubert Humphrey, darling of the same "liberals" who castigate "Big Advertising!"

Washingtonians note that, curiously, the same pundits who blasted the Revlon company for permitting the quiz shenanigans—made no mention whatever of their big-wheel Democratic lawyers.

Ike's Other Brother: Conspicuous on the just-published list of trustees for Americans for Constitutional Action is the name Eisenhower—not Dwight, not Milton, but Edgar, the President's older brother who criticized the 1957 Budget as too big and stuck to his guns. Economy-minded Edgar Eisenhower and ACA (located at 408 First St., S.E., Washington, D.C.) see eye-to-eye; ACA head Admiral Ben Moreell, in announcing the appointments, called for a return to constitutional conservatism and the elimination of "big, centralized, powerful, paternalistic, spendthrift and inflation-producing Government."

Conservatives everywhere are echoing the words of the New York *Daily News*: "We only hope the ACA prospers, goes from victory to victory, and inspires formation of many similar organizations dedicated to backing the President in his current fight against inflation."

Grasp the Weapons of Culture: This was the title of a speech given by V. J. Jerome before the US Communist party, and the Communists have obviously grasped them well.

While the Russians last week were viewing the American, but non-political, "Marty," Americans watched a slick and artful Soviet propaganda film, "The Cranes Are Flying," in the first swap of motion pictures under the US-USSR Cultural Exchange Agreement of 1958.

"The Cranes" was premiered this week in Washington's Metropolitan Theatre, where a Soviet flag was displayed with the Stars and Stripes and where a US Army band played the Russian national anthem.

Ostensibly a love story with a World War II background, the Cannes Festival prize-winning film was a masterful piece of propaganda. The viewer finds out that: (a) religion is commonplace in the Soviet Union (Grannie makes a big point of blessing her grandson, Boris, with the sign of the cross before he trots off to war); (b) the Russian people totally accept Soviet rule (the hero, of course, *volunteers* to defeat the Nazis and save the Soviets); and (c) the Soviets want peace.

But what did the US get in return for this Soviet soft-sell? The State Department says the reason for the exchange is twofold: (1) American companies already buy Soviet films while Soviet firms don't "buy American," and (2) the agreement of 1958 assures us that the Russians will see American films.

Observers point out, however, that American films are not "ideological" ("Marty" is a film solely about love and loneliness) and that none of the big distributors has been showing Soviet films. But now under the pact (put over by appeasement-minded Movie Czar Eric Johnston against the reluctant members of his Motion Picture Association), Warner Brothers, Fox, United Artists, Universal, MGM, Columbia, and Paramount will beam Soviet propaganda to the American public. (Americans shall soon see "And Quiet Flows the Don," a film based on a book glorifying Bolsheviks by Mikhail Sholokhov, who denounced Boris Pasternak as a "hermit-crab.")

Furthermore, there is nothing in the agreement, according to one of those who drew it up, that requires Soviet state-controlled theatres to show any of our films for any length of time. But the distributors here will show them "as long as they are commercially successful," says our informant.

Farm Probe: On Capitol Hill, experts on agriculture are proposing a new investigating committee which would presumably do for the evils of farm subsidies what the McClellan Rackets Committee did for the evils of labor boss power. (The educational results of the two years of the McClellan probes, it is felt, were a big factor in bringing about passage of the "tough" labor reform bill last summer.)

It is hoped that leaders of both parties in Congress will agree on the creation of such a new body after Congress convenes next January. It is hoped that Senator Harry F. Byrd (D.-Va.), whose interest in economy is well known, will accept the chairmanship; and that Senator Bush (R.-Conn.) will be co-chairman.

If the committee got underway by February 1, its labors in uncovering the reasons for the huge sums the Government has been pouring into subsidies, crop supports, soil bank, etc. would bear fruit by mid-summer. A report could be timed for the opening of the general election campaign in September. The electorate, then, would be well informed on this burning question.

With the eminently fair Senator Byrd at its helm, the group could explode the myth that the huge surpluses and agricultural appropriations are due to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, whom the "liberal" Democrats have made into a whipping boy. Veterans on the Hill know well that the Truman Administration provided the base for these "spend-and-support" policies and that the "liberal" Democrats in Congress have never allowed Benson full latitude for implementing his policy of lower price supports. By fall, the picture of our farm problem and the record of Government should be fairly presented to voters in the 1960 general election.

Reuther and Kennedy: Another chapter in the Kennedy-Reuther deal has unfolded. (HUMAN EVENTS reported in its issue of September 16, 1959, that Senator Kennedy—with the help of Brother Bob—was affording protection to Reuther against investigation by the Senate Rackets committee in the hope that the latter would take an "open-minded attitude" about the former's Presidential aspirations.) Last week Reuther made at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

least a superficial effort to boost Kennedy's stock with the multi-million-member Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, by offering a resolution absolving Kennedy of blame for the "tough" labor reform law passed by Congress this year.

Reuther's I.U.D., however, would not buy his resolution. In fact, at the I.U.D.'s Washington convention, the resolutions committee killed it before it reached the floor. But Reuther had made his gesture of loyalty to Kennedy, and many in the Nation's Capital believe that the resolution got as close to adoption as the UAW chieftain wanted it to. They are still willing to wager that Reuther will throw his full support behind the candidacy of Hubert Humphrey at the 1960 Democratic convention.

Spending: A sharp reversal of form by Republican Congressmen during the first session of the 86th Congress —if it carries over to next year—will provide the voters in 1960 with an important element lacking in the '58 election: a choice between a party that stands for fiscal solvency and a party that calls for economic suicide. According to figures published in the *Congressional Quarterly*, based on 97 key roll calls in the House and Senate, the average Republican voted against economy measures only 32 per cent of the time and for them 57 per cent, while his Democratic counterpart opposed such moves 72 per cent of the time and endorsed them in only 19 per cent of his votes.

Thus, in 1959 the Republicans—as did the President himself—ended the "me too" spending spree which marked the earlier years of the Eisenhower Administration. For, GOP legislators in the 1957-58 sessions had backed key measures to curtail Federal expenditures only 46 per cent of the time, opposed them nearly as often—41 per cent.

On the other hand, votes of the "liberal" Democratic majority in the 1959 session of Congress justified the label of "spenders" placed on its members as they charged into the Nation's Capital last January with grandiose schemes for "doing good" with the taxpayers' money. They voted six per cent less frequently for economy efforts than did the Democrats who made up the previous Congress.

The most economy-minded Republican Senators, according to *Congressional Quarterly's* breakdown of their roll call votes, were: Curtis, Williams, Hruska, Dworshak and Goldwater. Leading the Democrats were: Thurmond, Byrd of Virginia, Robertson, Lausche and Stennis.

Voting most often for higher spending were Democrats Jackson, McNamara, Carroll, Johnson and Hart. The GOP Senators most frequently in the "spending" class were Smith, Javits, Scott, Langer and Cooper, but significantly, none of these GOP "spenders" was much above the Democratic *average* in number of votes cast for higher spending,

Seven Southern Democratic members of the House led their party in endorsing lower Federal expenditures: Smith, Tuck, Abbitt, Harrison (all of Virginia), Murray (Tenn.), Whitten (Miss.) and Flynt (Ga.). Republican Representatives leading their party's economy drive were: Johansen (Mich.), Scherer (Ohio), Cunningham (Nebr.), Alger (Texas), Poff (Va.), Jonas (N.C.), and Devine (Ohio).

Bucking pleas from the President and the grass roots for restoration of the sound dollar were five Republicans who sided with the spenders most frequently in their votes on the tell-tale measures in the House. They were: Merrow (N.H.), Baldwin (Calif.), Rogers (Mass.), Fulton (Pa.) and Halpern (N.Y.).

But "liberal" Democratic Representatives really hit the jackpot in mustering opposition to economy. No less than 25 of them voted against economy 100 per cent of the time. They were: Johnson, C. W. Miller, Doyle and King (Calif.); Price, Libonati, O'Brien, O'Hara and Pucinski (Ill.); Foley (Md.); Oliver (Maine); Lane (Mass.); Karsten (Mo.); Daniels and Gallagher (N.J.); Clark, Prokop, Rhodes, Byrne, Nix and Toll (Pa.); Staggers (W. Va.); Johnson and Reuss (Wis.); and Inouye (Hawaii).

● The ranking of Lyndon Johnson as the fourth most prolific spender in the Senate is causing not a few chuckles among the politicos in Washington. For they have observed recent efforts by the left-wing ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) and "liberal" Senators Morse, Proxmire and Douglas to recreate an image of Lyndon as a southern conservative—and therefore unacceptable as a "liberal" Presidential candidate.

The four Democratic Presidential hopefuls in the Senate—all big-spending advocates—supported economy measures with a ridiculously small percentage of their votes: Kennedy 6%, Humphrey 7%, Symington 6% and Johnson 9%.

Capitol Camera: According to *Time* magazine, Senator Eugene McCarthy, co-chairman of the Presidential campaign of fellow Minnesota Senator Hubert Humphrey, was asked recently why he didn't run himself. Supposedly grinned McCarthy (who denies he said it and denies he grinned): "That's not a bad idea. I'm twice as liberal as *Humphrey*, twice as Catholic as *Kennedy* and twice as smart as *Symington*."

● The State Department last week issued a denial of a claim by the New York *Daily News* that the USIA has dropped the terms "free world" and "free nations" in broadcasts to Iron Curtain countries. (Reliable sources back up the charge—first reported in HUMAN EVENTS November 4—but even Congressmen cannot obtain USIA transcripts to check it out.) Now, says our inside source, let the State Department deny that, since the Khrushchev visit, USIA no longer prefaces broadcasts to Iron Curtain nations with the playing of their pre-Soviet national anthems.

● New England Rockefeller fans turned crimson recently after Harvard's Young Republicans released their latest Presidential preference poll, taken in New Hampshire, the big primary battlefield next spring. The students polled 401 persons in various locations at random without thought of their affiliations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Result: Nixon received 55 per cent of the vote, Kennedy 24 per cent, Rockefeller 11 per cent, others, 10 per cent.

Butler and the South: Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler has come up with a new way to harass the South. He is going to make southern delegates sit in the corner—like naughty little school children—at the 1960 Democratic convention in Los Angeles. That's the reaction in Washington to Butler's plan for giving preferred housing and the best convention seats to delegates from the states which have given the best financial support to the treasury of the national party.

It is no secret that southern states have been purposely holding back their contributions to the Democratic national headquarters in hopes of forcing the "liberal" Butler from office. As a result, delegates from nine of the twelve southern states may find themselves viewing convention proceedings from penalty boxes in the rafters of the L.A. Sports Arena.

● Meanwhile, Senator Strom Thurmond (D.-S.C.) continues to resist Butler's theory on the South. The Senator warned last week that "Democratic leaders show a tremendous lack of foresight and sagacity when they say they can win without the South." He added that the South "is becoming more independent with every election" and might rebel next year if an unsatisfactory Democratic candidate or platform is chosen.

"This is not just the South's fight," Thurmond concluded. "I think the labor and liberal wing is trying to get control of the Democratic party, and I'm bitterly opposed to it."

Controls Make Slums: Rent controls in New York City are producing uncontrolled slums, according to a recent article in the "liberal" *Reporter* magazine.

Despite the population *decline* since 1950, states author Gerald Burns, "the housing shortage is more apparent than ever."

Unable to hike rents (controlled since 1943) to meet the leaps in cost of living, landlords let their dwellings deteriorate, or worse, abandon them to speculators who take no interest in their investment except as a means of grabbing current income.

"These are the new slum makers, master grade," says Burns, "and they are at work everywhere in the city."

The city's bureaucrats are totally ill-equipped to enforce any sort of standards, as tenants, grown used to drafty hallways, frayed carpets, and bad plumbing, deluge the beleaguered Rent Commission with nearly 3,000 new complaint-cases each working day.

New York's decontrolled units (new housing completed after February 1, 1947, and not subject to control) amount to about one-fifth of total housing accommodation, but these new dwellings are exorbitant with three-room apartments at a sky-high $172 a month.

The net result has been to send an estimated million "young members of the middle income group" fleeing from the city because they cannot find moderately priced, good housing.

Federal Aid: North Carolina is setting an example for the rest of the Nation in how to revitalize depressed areas without Federal aid. Since 1954 communities in that state have been encouraging development of new industries to manufacture items previously purchased from out-of-state. Some 300 such industries have sprouted in North Carolina during that period, and of great significance—only one has failed.

In lauding North Carolina's approach to the depressed area problem, Ward Miller, Jr., high-ranking Department of Commerce official, says that the blighted coal-mining region of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia must launch a similar "do-it-yourself" program or continue to face a chronic depression.

Taxes: There was a recession in the US during the fiscal year of 1958, but historians will have a difficult time taking it seriously when they discover the total amount of Federal, state and local taxes Americans paid during that period. In fiscal '58, the tax take by all levels of government amounted to $98.3 billion—an average of $565 from each living American.

Although the recession year take by the Federal Government was some $1.8 billion less than for fiscal '57, this loss was largely offset by an increase in state and local taxes of $1.5 billion. State and local taxes are skyrocketing by leaps and bounds annually. From an average of $123 per person in 1951, they had zoomed up to $175 through fiscal '58.

● Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Budget, recently said that the US taxpayers could gain a tax cut, without any reduction in military spending, if they demanded elimination of nonessential spending in other areas. Commenting on the Stans statement for the Washington *Daily News*, UPI's Washington Bureau Manager Lyle C. Wilson writes: "Taxpayers must be fired up considerably before they will put that kind of pressure on Congress. Firing up the taxpayers will be quite a job. They seem fireproof, else there would have been long since in the United States a political explosion to blow a lot of free-wheeling, free-spending politicos out of office and back to the boondocks."

REV. WALTER H. KOENIG, St. Matthew Evangelical Lutheran Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.: "I do appreciate the very timely information you present. You give all who love our land and its precious liberties much food for thought. Keep up the good work."

REV. GARDNER A. MacWHORTER, Episcopal Diocese of Chicago, Ill.: "Of great value to the priest in his Sunday work. More power to HUMAN EVENTS and its good work."

REV. LLOYD R. MARKLEY, Berean Baptist Church, Nampa, Idaho: "As a minister, I consider HUMAN EVENTS a very reliable source of world and US news. I would not want to be without it."

REV. JOHN M. YOUNGINER, Bethel Methodist Church, Spartanburg, S.C.: "I read each issue of HUMAN EVENTS and have learned to consider in an intelligent commentary on current events both national and international. I like it better than any other news commentary I receive."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 46 HUMAN EVENTS November 18, 1959

Article Section I

STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Hopeless Case

The Strange Record of New Jersey's Clifford Case

By FINIS FARR

Veteran free lance writer, political observer and long-time resident of New Jersey

A POPULAR NEW JERSEY parlor game is trying to figure out the real motives of the state's allegedly Republican Senator, a smiling, handsome man named Clifford Philip Case. Many voters are beginning to feel that there is something uncomfortably enigmatic in that smile. These voters have also concluded that Mr. Case's frequent speeches and statements to the press are like the magician's patter which diverts the audience's attention while an illusion is created on the stage. And a magician Mr. Case must be from now on, these citizens are saying, if he is to be re-elected in the face of a long overdue analysis of his voting record in Congress.

For a man of Mr. Case's background, his record is strange indeed. It closely follows the line laid down by the leftist Americans for Democratic Action, an extraordinarily dubious group of ideologues whose object is to take over the Federal Government and put it under control of a partnership of labor bosses and Fabian Socialists. The fact that this would confiscate all individual liberty seems to trouble the ADAologues no more than it does their faithful follower, Clifford Case.

His strange career entered its national political phase when Mr. Case arrived in Washington, as a freshman Representative, in 1943. He immediately distinguished himself by a maiden speech—in atrocious taste for a newcomer—which was a furious attack on a colleague from Mississippi with years of seniority. Just what the Mississippian had done to the people of Mr. Case's district in New Jersey was never made clear. But the speech did show the complacent self-assurance which was to characterize all Mr. Case's public statements; and he has not altered his tone or tactics throughout the ensuing 16 years.

Sometimes Mr. Case's voting is apparently dictated by a desire to register on both sides of a given question. An example of this was his vote against making the House Committee on Un-American Activities a permanent body, which was followed by his vote in favor of appropriating the money to run it—cast, of course, after the House had overwhelmingly decided to continue the Committee.

Mr. Case's general strategy appears to be that of going as far toward socialism as he dares in the opening rounds, then drawing back only to the extent that he is compelled to. This pattern was seen when he joined his great friend Jacob Javits of New York on February 5, 1959, to back the appalling, near-$3-billion housing bill against the $1.8 billion version the Administration suggested. He later attempted to cover his tracks by supporting the Presidential veto of the bill he had originally voted for in its most inflationary form. This was a matter in which Mr. Case was working against the stability of the Nation as a whole. But he is also fond of casting his vote against the freedom and dignity of the individual citizen, as when he again joined Javits to vote against the McClellan amendments to the Senate labor reform bill which were designed to outlaw secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing, through which so many helpless persons have been bullied and assaulted.

It was on this critical labor issue in Congress last year that Mr. Case showed what he apparently thought was great virtuosity in trying to proceed in two different directions at the same time. He attempted this by voting for Senator McClellan's "Labor Bill of Rights," and then going to work to help put through the highly diluted alteration which was much more to the liking of the labor bosses. In the nine key roll calls on labor reform in this session of Congress, Mr. Case voted favorably only twice. In accordance with his usual strategy, these favorable votes were on legislation that was sure of passing anyway—the Kennedy bill and the conference report on the Landrum-Griffin bill—which he had fought to the best of his ability to weaken and water down before the vote was taken.

Thus, while the country is shocked by the arrogance of the labor bosses in their threatening yells to legislators over the passage of even the mildest reforms, Mr. Case need have no fear of anything so unpleasant. The labor barons have long had reason to be very fond of him. Taking a sample at random, we find that in 1951, for example, the political contact men of the CIO ordered votes on 10 key issues and were pleased to record that Mr. Case went their way in nine of them. (The other time he was absent.) Or take the following year, when CIO instructions went out on 16 issues. From the CIO standpoint, Mr. Case voted right 15 times, and failed them only—as before—on the one occasion when he was absent.

Such is Mr. Case's dependable performance—for the labor bosses. Now let us have a look at some of the measures, not directly concerned with big labor, but approved by leftists in general and the ADA in particular, for which Mr. Case has cast his senatorial vote. The list is long, but a brief selection from it includes his support of measures designed to:

> Allow the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to indulge in a year of boondoggles costing $465 million more than the amount budgeted for the Department.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. — Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Allow the Treasury to borrow $5 billion and give it away all around the world without coming to Congress for appropriations.

Scale down the oil and gas depletion allowance which makes it possible to risk capital to hunt further fuel resources for the country at large.

Hand to the Executive unlimited authority to give American taxpayers' money to the Communists anywhere in the world.

Continue to give American taxpayers' money to countries which steal American property and throw American citizens in jail.

Spend $2 billion of taxpayers' money to build schools which local communities would otherwise build for themselves.

These examples of Mr. Case's style of play—all from 1958 and 1959—show that he has a remarkably carefree attitude toward other people's money. On these lines, Mr. Case recently proposed that railroads be compelled to pay any workers dislodged by economy moves their full salaries for four years thereafter. This would be a long step toward nationalization of all common carriers. But Mr. Case is equally casual toward the contents of the public till, as was evidenced by his strong support of Senator Javits, last July, in several attempts to kill the loyalty oath requirement for students asking for Federal funds under the National Defense Education Act. Obviously Mr. Case held that if foreigners were not required to pledge loyalty to the US when putting their hands into the US taxpayers' pocket, it would be neither proper nor fair to ask US students to do so.

Mr. Case is viewed with suspicion not only by Republicans, but by thoughtful independents and Democrats as well. They feel that the medicine bottle which he so smilingly holds aloft has been deliberately misbranded. They also are convinced that under any label its contents are highly detrimental, if not fatally poisonous, to the best interests of the USA.

IT IS NOT FORGOTTEN that Mr. Case resigned his seat in the House of Representatives in August of 1953 to become president of the Fund for the Republic. He seemed quite at home in this strange organization, which has plagued the country with so many ill-advised projects that huge volumes would be needed to record them in detail. But highly typical, and expressive of the Fund's point of view, was its payment of $5,000 to a library board in Pennsylvania for protecting an employee (the head librarian) who invoked the Fifth Amendment when asked to confirm or deny membership in the Communist party. Aside from occasional token gestures of impartiality, the main impact of this Fund's propaganda is that there is something seriously wrong with the protection of civil liberties in the US and that the Nation is in mortal danger from extremist elements on the right. This is precisely the line which is pounded out, night and day, by the Kremlin propaganda mills. The Fund makes much of "workshops" (brainwashing centers) and "group dynamics" (mob manipulation). All this must be recorded even in a brief study of Mr. Case because there is no evidence to show that it was anything but acceptable to him while he sat at the head of the Fund.

Whatever future projects were approved during Mr. Case's nine active months at the Fund, he was out of it in 1954 and heading again for Washington, this time with the Senate in view. New Jersey voters still do not understand how Clifford Case came to be the only nominee in the Republican primary, but have a vivid memory of high pressure throughout the districts. Then and there, thousands of New Jersey Republicans decided they had had enough of Mr. Case and his presumably well-meaning supporters. In this crisis the national party came loyally to Mr. Case's aid, with public blessings by Mr. Eisenhower at a White House lunch arranged by Everett Dirksen, chairman of the Senate Campaign Policy Committee. Mr. Case was later to repay Mr. Dirksen for this invaluable help by joining a cabal attempting to deprive him of Senate leadership. But at the time, Mr. Case was happy to have this kind of support, and he surely needed it, for he got in, after a recount, by a scant 3,400 of the more than 1,000,000 votes cast.

It is conceivable that those who supported Mr. Case for the Senate believed he would be more thoughtful as a member of the upper house, and that he would give careful study to the grave matters before that body. If so, they were terribly mistaken, as the record shows. With that record now fully before the public, it seems highly unlikely that Mr. Case can achieve re-election, if he seeks it, or that his naming a successor could be anything but a kiss of death. Perhaps he will return to the shadowy world of the left-leaning tax-free foundations and be reasonably happy there. Whatever his future course, Jerseyites might smile while thinking of their smiling ex-Senator—except that it really is not funny at all.

HERE WAS A MAN in a position calling for a thorough and objective mastery of facts, an unalterable instinct for preserving workable political structures, a rocklike ability not to become intoxicated with the thrill of spending other people's money, delicate analysis of issues and above all, balanced judgment before speech and action. Instead of these qualities, Mr. Case seemed to have only a deep lack of consistent knowledge, a fundamental disrespect for ordinary people, and an unassailable belief that he was the possessor of infallible wisdom.

Therefore the voters of New Jersey will probably remember Mr. Case only as an unusually well-rounded example of what not to elect. Future political historians may list this as Clifford Case's one useful contribution to his country.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "HOPELESS CASE" at $_____

[] Payment enclosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 46 HUMAN EVENTS November 18, 1959

Article Section II

The Gifted Child

A Victim of Professional Educators

By JAMES D. KOERNER

Executive Director of the Council for Basic Education

NOW THAT THE PUBLIC and some of our professional pedagogues have been Sputnik'd out of their educational complacency, the prospects are brighter in regard to a number of school problems, especially that of educating the gifted child. We will talk about him at least, whether we do anything or not. He is now being discussed exhaustively and redundantly in the press, the journals, the magazines, in conferences and committees, and we guess, in the White House. My only reason for adding to this cascade of words is to make a few points that seem regularly to be overlooked.

First, however, a little sweeping out of educational cobwebs might be a healthful exercise. Let's begin by clearing the room of the standard cliches of the standard defenders of the *status quo*—who, when confronted with criticism of the way we educate gifted children, are likely these days to say something like this:

1. "We can be immensely proud of our educational system, for never in the history of man has so much been done for so many at so little cost. Never has a nation succeeded so nobly in meeting all the needs of all the children of all the people. Still, despite our magnificent record, you may not be altogether wrong in thinking that we have not necessarily done quite as much as, with more money, we might possibly have done for the exceptionally intellectual . . . that is, the rapid learner . . . that is to say, the academically talented child."

2. *"Of course, the 'fortunate deviates,' as we sometimes refer to them, are the subject of exaggerated concern right now, but we have always been concerned with them. We have experimented for years with acceleration, parallel classes, homogeneous grouping, but especially with 'enrichment.' We can advance no empirically valid, scientific, thoroughly researched conclusions as yet, but we are aware of enormous problems."*

3. "The chief problem is that of protecting our democratic ideals. We must forever be on our guard against creating an undemocratic clique within our educational ranks, an oppressive aristocracy of the mind—an intellectual elite! The American people have always rejected class society and have forged this great Nation in the image of COMMON MAN. They will have no philosopher-kings, either in Washington or in our classrooms."

4. *"Then there is the mental-health problem of the fortunate deviate himself. He has deep emotional and citizenship adjustments to make if we single him out for distinction and separate him from his general peer group. After all, he must learn, even more thoroughly than his fellows, the techniques of how to get along with people, especially in group situations."*

5. "Despite all these handicaps, we perhaps could do something more for the fortunate deviate. But first the public must start supporting the idea, and stop criticizing the schools."

BRAINWASHED in this fashion for years, the public was understandably shocked by the first Sputnik and what it said about Soviet education. Not that the public itself was not culpable, as were all of us. Of course, we all share the guilt. Of course, the schoolmen are not alone responsible for all our educational troubles (and are not being made "scapegoats," as they insist they are with masochistic regularity). Of course, we as a people are non-intellectual, if not anti-intellectual. Of course, we have all "neglected the gifted child," as well as much else in education. But it ill-behooves professional educators, to whom the public looks for educational *leadership*, to indulge in this platitudinous self-eulogy about their own triumphs in the face of great odds. The least they can do is to stay abreast of and exploit a public opinion that is obviously ready to take special care of the bright children with whom we are blessed, and to pay the necessary cost. What the public is waiting for is the lagging educationists themselves. It is waiting for the leadership it usually buys at a handsome figure but doesn't seem to get.

The chief obstacle the professionals can't seem to conquer is their own mythology of the common man and their grotesque fear that special attention to the gifted will create a special social class. The

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. — Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"literature" of the subject is filled with such unexamined assumptions. For instance, the term, "intellectual elite," inevitably makes its appearance wherever gifted children (one must never call them superior!) are discussed. Education is plagued with shibboleths like this one, and they sound impressive enough until one takes a second look and tries to decide what exactly they mean.

IT WOULD BE A SIGNAL SERVICE to gifted children if someone could put to rest for good this term, "intellectual elite," or at least give it some kind of definition. Right now it is only a meaningless slogan in which to take refuge from thought. What *is* an intellectual elite, anyhow? What societies have ever had one and how have they suffered from it? We can think of a good many Utopias, beginning with Plato's, that advocated it, but not many societies that ever had one. Fifth-Century Greece might come close (and everybody knows to what a low state of civilization *it* fell).

Are we really to assume, then, that it would be a mortal threat to our way of life if we were to give the same kind of special attention to the gifted that we now give to the retarded? Or to football players, baton twirlers, and school queens for a day? Are we really to continue in the name of Democracy to undermine, as we have systematically and pigheadedly undermined in the past, our best hope of the future because we think free men dare not recognize and reward talent? Are we really to deny the true democratic rights of the gifted for fear of producing tyrants instead of Jeffersons, Millikans, even John Deweys, and other uncommon men? If we answer yes, we might be wise to resign ourselves to cultural, not to mention national, suicide. And we will have earned it.

For that matter, even taking it for granted that the United States is not likely under any circumstances to foster an intellectual elite, we haven't yet heard anybody say what exactly would be *wrong* with it. Maybe people who have had a modern education (with its common learnings, group dynamics, and workshops in human relations and democratic living) would know what is wrong with it. But we wish somebody would tell the rest of us. Presumably the educationist conjures up with this loaded term a picture of America as a hardened class society divided between brainless slobs and brainy snobs; but he doesn't explain how such stratification would be possible in a system of universal education. If, however, the term means that intellectual leadership in any field is to be rewarded with special distinction, with money and prestige and other marks of society's favor, we think there is a lot to be said for it.

Actually, things are looking up since Sputnik (no pun intended) in this matter of educating gifted children. At least many educationists have come round to admitting that there *is* a problem here and that it could stand re-examination. And that is a considerable victory. Many of them, in fact, have come to feel that the need for quality in education is pressing and widespread, and that it might be both politic and altruistic to provide increased help for gifted children. The only thing that bothers me is that this bandwagon for quality was put in orbit, not by those who should have done it 20 or 30 years ago, the educationists themselves—but by an aroused scientific community, a worried Government, a frightened public, and a group of educational critics. Everyone is welcome, of course. I only hope that nobody is along just for the ride.

FOR THE RECORD, and by way of recapitulation, I should like to propound a few self-evident truths: (1) That all men are created equal as human beings, but obviously not as intellectual beings; (2) that the intelligence of the few has been the chief means by which man has been raised from savagery; (3) that the intelligence of the few is also indispensable to the survival of all of us, not to mention our advancement; (4) that our democratic ideals mean and have always meant recognition of the human rights of each person, including the right to *equal opportunity;* (5) that the best possible education for every child is an unmistakable mandate from the public, but that it is only a perversion of this mandate to insist on the *same* education for all children or to glorify the lowest common intellectual denominator; and (6) that special education—special efforts at identification, special classes, special teachers, even special schools for gifted children—are not only justified in the interests of those children and of the Nation, but should be the urgent concern of all of us.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE GIFTED CHILD" at $_____

[] Payment enclosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED